

over the next 10 years, is it worth borrowing money from the Chinese and sending the bill to our children and grandchildren?

Mr. Chairman, I say "no." I say "no" so that I can say "yes" to my 5-year-old son's future, my 7-year-old daughter's future, and the future of all the children and great grandchildren of our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. I understand the hope of my colleague from Texas to rein in excessive government spending, but he is really misguided on this one.

This is a project that would provide real benefit to the residents of the Borough of South River, and as a demonstration project it would serve as an example for the rest of New Jersey and the Northeast and indeed the whole Nation of how to use technology to conserve energy, to use it more wisely. In fact, every dollar spent, to paraphrase my friend here, on smart metering, is indeed a dollar well spent.

My constituents in New Jersey pay some of the highest utility rates in the Nation. In the Borough of South River, they are seeking assistance to help decrease the electric bills of the borough residents, and they're seeking to demonstrate that this works. Funding for the automated remote electric project will provide relief to the constituents in this municipal energy system, and it will serve as a wonderful example.

South River owns and operates its own utilities. It's moving toward implementing a borough-wide smart grid. This metering that the borough intends to purchase is the first step toward this eventual goal. They would provide real-time consumption information. It would allow the users to make wise decisions based on the real cost of service in real time.

It's just exactly what we have been discussing here in the House of Representatives in recent weeks. It's well established in the scientific community that climate change of recent decades can be attributed to the way we produce and use energy and that climate change is altering our planet in ways that are expensive and deadly.

I spoke to the mayor of South River yesterday, who assured me that he is ready to go ahead with the project. It's one of their top priorities. They have been working on it for years, one in which they have already made considerable investment in preparing an efficient municipal utility.

□ 1745

This will serve, as I say, as an example.

I might add that the gentleman's home State of Texas ranks 32nd in the Nation in tax dollars returned from Washington. My home State of New Jersey ranks considerably lower than that. As a so-called donor State, I don't

apologize to my constituents for working to return their tax dollars. I really only regret that all municipal utilities in the country are not funded to convert to smart metering. This is certainly a good investment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I saw that the gentleman from New Jersey was lamenting the high energy rates of his constituents. And although I don't have the House RECORD in front of me, I'm under the impression he recently voted for the national energy tax, which would cost his constituents anywhere from \$1,500 to \$3,000 a year.

Second of all, I believe in the value of demonstration projects as well. My constituents would like a demonstration project of fiscal sanity in the United States Congress. They have yet to see one. Here is a small demonstration project of fiscal sanity on behalf of our children and grandchildren by adopting this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. May I ask the Chair the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Let me try to figure out why it is that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is proposing to do this. I can assure, I think it is unlikely that he knows as much about this project as I do, but I must say energy has been my professional field for most of my life.

This is, I would argue, a good investment. To refer to the comments of my colleague from Massachusetts a while ago, this approach of trying to deal with the deficit and excess spending one project at a time is sort of a waste. If the gentleman is really concerned about this, I presume that we will find his vote in the "aye" column next week when we consider pay-as-you-go legislation.

If he's concerned about earmarks, as a concept, then I would say, yes, the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, speaking on behalf of the White House, should have included this project in their request to Congress and many more like it. But they didn't.

And so, is the gentleman saying that the House of Representatives should just be an up-or-down vote on what the President sends to us? The President will decide what the budget should be. We take it or leave it.

Well, no, that's not the way it should work. This is something that I offer. It provides no partisan political advantage. In fact, the mayor of this town is from the other party. No one from the borough, to my knowledge, has made any campaign contribution to any Member of Congress, any member of the borough government. No lobbyist is involved in this.

This is just good policy. It should have been in the budget sent over by the President, but it wasn't. Lots of things should be in the budget sent over by the President, but they're not. That's why we scrub the budget and de-

cide what should be added and what should be subtracted. Call it earmarking if you want, but I don't. I would hope that the gentleman would not think that we should abdicate our responsibilities here as Members.

I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NYE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3183) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

JUMP-STARTING OUR ECONOMY

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the number of empty storefronts across Kansas is growing, and the folks who call our towns home continue to ask, Where are the jobs?

They hear about bailouts and the \$1 trillion so-called economic stimulus, but Kansans are still struggling.

The Nation's deficit has topped \$1 trillion for the first time, and some say it could grow to \$2 trillion by this fall. We should be ashamed. But rather than putting the brakes on this out of control spending spree, some think Washington needs to spend more.

Mr. Speaker, when does it stop?

Instead of taxing small businesses out of existence, we should provide tax relief so they can hire more employees and create jobs. Instead of throwing money at programs that aren't working, we should find responsible ways to cut spending.

Small businesses and innovative Americans hold the key to jump-starting our economy. It's time for Washington to let them do their job.

MEDICAL RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, this is what the House government health care bill creates: \$1 trillion, 1,000 pages, \$1 billion per page. Here is the patient, and over here is the doctor.

Now, moderate Republicans have a much better plan we will put forward. Our Medical Rights Act says Congress cannot restrict the decisions of you and your doctor and eliminates the need for all of this, and puts you right next to your physician, without the need for \$1 trillion in spending.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 648

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from House Resolution 648.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), amended by Public Law 108-375, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Mr. POLIS, Colorado

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California

Mr. LAMBORN, Colorado

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY— TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT INTRU- SION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the United States Constitution, article I, section 2, it states that every 10 years there will be a counting of the people. The purposes are twofold: One, to levy direct taxes, and second, to find out how many people live in the United States so that Members of Congress can be apportioned percentage-wise based on population. That is the purpose of the census, and it's a good purpose. Next year we will have another undertaking of the census, of the counting of the people in the United States.

But also, independent of the census, there is a survey that is being taken, given, rather, to American citizens, 3 million next year and 3 million every year. Now, I want to make it clear that

this is not the census, but this is a system of surveying the American people, and it just so happens that today I got one of these surveys. It's labeled from the United States Department of Commerce, the Census Bureau, and it's the American Community Survey, and it says, Your response is required by law.

You open this document, you get a lot of paperwork. You get several documents that say you have to fill this out or by penalty of law if you don't, but you get the survey. Mr. Speaker, the American Community Survey is 28 pages. If a person receives one of these and doesn't fill it out, you've violated Federal law.

Now, the survey contains a lot of information that makes me wonder, Why does the Federal Government even want this information? Why should the Federal Government even have this information?

And here's some of the questions that it asks: the value of your residence, how much you pay monthly for your residence on your mortgage, how many rooms in your house, how many toilets are in your house, what kind of vehicles do you drive. I guess they want to know how many pickups are in Texas.

Do you have a stove? a refrigerator? What type of fuel do you use? How much does it cost you each month to use that fuel? How much does each person in the household or in the residence, rather, make? What is their income? Where do they work? What do they do? How long have they done that? What is the cost of the mortgage? What is the cost of health insurance for each person, and what is the cost of taxes in the house? And it goes on and on and on, 28 pages, required by Federal law under the American Community Survey Act.

I won't go into all the questions because I don't have time, but I'd like to mention one more. One question is, each person has to answer this question, because of a physical, mental or emotional condition, does the person have trouble concentrating, remembering, or making decisions?

Now, should the Federal Government have that information? And why should a person in the residence make that determination about themselves and then have to answer that question for everybody else in the residence?

I certainly hope they're all getting along well.

It also asks, because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition, does the person have difficulty dressing, doing errands, difficulty shopping? And it goes on and on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Back in 2007, two historians found some old documents from the Department of Commerce archives and the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Presidential Library. These documents confirmed for the first time that the Census Bureau turned over information to incarcerate over 100,000 individual Japanese Americans after the Pearl Harbor attack. This information was reported by USA Today. The Census Bu-

reau information made it all possible. Of course, the Census Bureau has denied that it gave that information. But be it as it may, it was legal in 1940.

In 1942, documents proved the Census Bureau turned over these addresses of the Japanese Americans to the War Department. In 1943, they turned over their financial information to the Department of the Treasury.

□ 1800

This was all nice and legal in the War Powers Act of 1940. It was legal, but it wasn't ethical, and we know what happened to 100,000 Japanese Americans. They were interned. The point is this, Mr. Speaker. This should be voluntary. If United States citizens want to give all of this information to the Federal Government so the Federal Government can have a file on everybody, then they should be allowed to do that, I guess, but it shouldn't be required by law. That is why I've introduced legislation to allow citizens not to fill this document out if they don't want to, because it invades, in my opinion, their personal privacy rights.

Once again, I'm not talking about the census. I am talking about the survey that is being required by law to be sent out. People down in southeast Texas, people who live in Cut and Shoot, Texas, for example, shouldn't be required to fill this information out. It violates their privacy. It's too much government. It may be well-intended, but the Federal Government should not have this information, and we as Members of Congress should allow this information to be, not required, but voluntarily given by the people of the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

H.R. 3183: ENERGY AND WATER DE- VELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 3183, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010.

I applaud the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member for moving this important bill through the Appropriations Committee and to the House floor.

This bill funds some of the most critical programs in south Florida, where I live, and my constituents are very much in tune with this particular bill.